

Appendix A

Bibliography

Allen, J.P., S. Philliber, and N. Hoggson. (1990). *School-Based Prevention of Teen-age Pregnancy and School Dropout: Process Evaluation of the National Replication of the Teen Outreach Program*, *American Journal of Community Psychology* 18:505–524.

Bazemore, G., T.J. Dicker, and R. Nyhan. (1994). *Juvenile Justice Reform and the Difference It Makes: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of Policy Change on Detention Worker Attitudes*. *Crime and Delinquency* 40:18–36.

Benson, P. and Galbraith, J. 1995. *What Kids Need to Succeed*. Minneapolis MN: Free Spirit Publishing Inc.

Benard, B. (1991). *Fostering Resiliency in Kids: Protective Factors in the Family, School, and Community*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Cohen, M.A. (1994). *The Monetary Value of Saving a High Risk Youth*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Comer, J. (1984). Home-School Relationships as They Affect the Academic Success of Children. *Education and Urban Society* 16: 323-337.

Davidson, W.S., E. Seidman, J. Rappaport, P. Berck, N. Rapp, W. Rhodes, and J. Herring. (1977). *Diversification Programs for Juvenile Offenders*. *Social Work Research and Abstracts* 13.

Dawes, R.M., D. Faust, and P. Meehl. (1989). *Clinical Versus Actuarial Judgment*. *Science* 243:1668–1674.

DeComo, R. (1993). *The Juveniles Taken Into Custody Research Program: Estimating the Prevalence of Juvenile Custody by Race and Gender*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Eck, J.E., and D.P. Rosenbaum. (1994). *The New Police Order: Effectiveness, Equity, and Efficiency in Community Policing*. In Dennis Rosenbaum (ed.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Elliott, D.S., D. Huizinga, and S. Menard. (1989). *Multiple Problem Youth: Delinquency, Substance Use and Mental Health Problems*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Edmonds, R. (1986). Characteristics of Effective Schools. In U. Neisser, Ed., *The School Achievement of Minority Children: New Perspectives* (pp. 93-104). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Feldman, R.A., T.E. Caplinger, and J.S. Wodarski. (1983). *The St. Louis Conundrum: The Effective Treatment of Anti-social Youths*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garmezy, N. (1991). Resiliency and Vulnerability to Adverse Developmental Outcomes Associated with Poverty. *American Behavioral Scientist* 34: 416-430.

Garmezy, N. (1985). *Stress-Resistant Children: The Search for Protective Factors*. In J.E. Stevenson (ed.), *Recent Research in Developmental Psychopathology*. Book supplement to *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*

Goldstein, H. (1994). Foreword. In Dennis Rosenbaum (ed.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Gottschalk, R., W. Davidson, L. Gensheimer, and J. Mayer. (1987). *Community-Based Interventions*. In H. Quay (ed.), *Handbook of Juvenile Delinquency*. New York, NY: Wiley and Sons.

Hawkins, J.D. and Catalano, R.F. (1989) *Risk-Focused Prevention: From Research To Practical Strategies. High Risk youth Update*. (April)

Hawkins, J.D., and R.F. Catalano. (1992). *Communities That Care*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Heath, S.B., and M.W. McLaughlin, Eds. (1993). *Identity and Inner-City Youth: Beyond Ethnicity and Gender*. New York: Teachers College Press..

Hill, P. (1976). On goods and services. Review of Income and Wealth, 315-338.

Howell, J.C. (1995). *The Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Wash. D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Huizinga, D., F.A. Esbensen, and A. Weiher. (1991). *Are There Multiple Paths to Delinquency?* *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 82.

Huizinga, D., R. Loeber, and T.P. Thornberry. (1997). *The Prevention of Serious Delinquency and Violence: Implications from the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency*. Washington, DC: Report submitted to U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Lipsey, M.W. (1992). *Juvenile Delinquency Treatment, Meta-Analysis for Explanation: A Case Book*. N.Y. N. Y.: Russell Sage Foundation

Lober, R. and Dishion, T.J. (1987) *Antisocial and Delinquent Youths: Methods for Their Early Identification*. In Burchard – 5.

Males, Mike A. (1999). *Framing Youth*. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press

Males, Mike A. (1996). *The Scapegoat Generation, America's War on Adolescents*. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press

McKnight, John and Kretzmann, John, *Building Communities from the Inside Out, A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*, Chicago, ACTA Publications, (1993)

Mendel, R.A. 1995. *Prevention or Pork? A Hard-Headed Look at Youth-Oriented Anti-Crime Programs*. Washington D.C.: American Youth Policy Forum

Miller, Patricia, H. *Theories of Developmental Psychology*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Co. 3 rd. Ed.1993

Miller, W.B. (1962). *The Impact of a 'Total-Community' Delinquency Control Project*. *Social Problems* 10.

Osborne, David and Gaebler, Ted, *Reinventing Government, How the entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Penguin Group, 1993.

Rutter, M., B. Maughan, P. Mortimore, J. Ouston, and A. Smith. (1979). *Fifteen Thousand Hours*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sarason, S. (1990). *The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schorr Lisbeth B. with Schorr, Daniel. (1988). *Within Our Reach*. NY. NY. Doubleday, Anchor Books

Schorr Lisbeth B. (1997). *Common Purpose, Strengthening Families and Neighborhoods to Rebuild America*. NY. NY. Random House, Anchor Books

Slavin, R.E. (1990). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Spivak, G. and Ciani, N. (1987) High-risk Early Behavior Pattern and Later Delinquency. In Burchard – 5.

Roos, P. (1997, April). *Measurement Of Productivity In Hospital Services Using Malmquist Index Approaches: A Discussion Of Methods And Illustration To Eye Survey*.

Thornberry, T.P. (1994). *Violent Families and Youth Violence*. Fact Sheet #21. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Thornberry, T., Huizinga, D. and Loeber, R. 1995. *Source Book on Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.

Tolan, P., and Guerra, N. 1994 *What Works in Reducing Adolescent Violence, An Empirical Review of the Field*.: The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado.

Watt, N.F. (1986) Prevention of Major Mental Illness: Risk Factors In Schizophrenic and Depressive Disorders. In NMHA -- 5

Weis, L., and M. Fine, Eds. (1993). *Beyond Silenced Voices: Class, Race, and Gender in United States Schools*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Werner, E., and R. Smith. (1989). *Vulnerable but Invincible: A Longitudinal Study of Resilient Children and Youth*. New York: Adams, Bannister, and Cox.

Werner, E., and R. Smith. (1992). *Overcoming the Odds: High-Risk Children from Birth to Adulthood*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Wilson, J.Q., and R.J. Hernstein. (1985). *Crime and Human Nature*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Wilson, J.Q., and G.L. Kelling. (1982). *Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety*. Atlantic Monthly (March): 29–38.

Wolfgang, M., T.P. Thornberry, and R.M. Figlio. (1987). *From Boy to Man, From Delinquency to Crime*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Appendix B

Definition of Terms

Definition of Terms

501(c)(3)

Another term for a nonprofit organization. If an organization has a “501(c)(3) designation” or “501(c)(3) status,” then it is legally a **nonprofit organization** as determined by the Federal Government. If an organization is not a 501(c)(3), then it is not legally a nonprofit organization.

Board of Directors

A Board of Directors is a required organizational component of a corporation, whether it is a for-profit or **Nonprofit Organization**. Boards have formal responsibilities and ensure that funds are used to fulfill the mission of the organization. Formal responsibilities of Boards include, but are not limited to:

1. To ensure that the organization stays in compliance with laws and regulations relating to nonprofit corporations
2. To ensure that the organization uses its resources toward the fulfillment of its mission as stated in its tax-exempt **501(c)(3)** purpose
3. To determine the organization’s mission, strategies, and program priorities
4. To hire and supervise a Chief Executive Officer or Executive Director who manages the corporation

Client/Customer, Unduplicated Client/Customer

The person receiving **Service** from a public agency or nonprofit organization. The client in BEST is a child or youth. An Unduplicated Client is a client that is counted only once, no matter how much service the client receives. Example: if 1 youth attends an program 3 days per week for 25 weeks per year, this youth would be counted as 1 unduplicated client even though s/he would attend the program approximately 75 times per year.

Cognitive Behavior Activity

Activities designed to assist youth to change and improve the way they think and behave. For example youth with an anti-social or criminal mindset are encouraged to try out new behaviors that are pro-social. Instead of hitting someone when they are angry, they try out non-violent methods of explaining to a person why their behavior upsets them and works to build an improved relationship that meets the needs of both parties. Perhaps the philosopher who most closely capture the basic premise of Cognitive Behavior Activities and Change is Victor Frankl reflecting on his experience as a prisoner in a Nazi concentration camp “...everything can be taken from a man but one thing: the last of the human freedoms – to choose one’s attitude in any given set of circumstances, to choose one’s own way.”

Cost-Effective

Costs that are at or below what can be expected for running programs that provide quality services. Keep in mind that different kinds of services will have different costs. For example, it may cost more to run a one-on-one counseling program than it does to run a group sports program, so total cost or **Cost Per Unit of Service** alone cannot be used to determine whether a program is cost-effective.

Cost per Unit of Service

Cost per Unit of Service is the amount of money it takes to provide 1 **Unit of Service**. A Unit of Service is simply a measurement of the amount of **Services** provided to the **Client**. BEST has defined 1 Unit of Service to be the same as 1 hour of service. For example, if a youth receives 3 hours of tutoring, that would count as 3 Units of Service. For example, if it costs \$24 to provide 3 Units of Service (3 hours of tutoring), then the Cost per Unit of Service would be:

$$\$24 / 3 \text{ Units of Service} = \$8 \text{ per Unit of Service}$$

Cost per hour of service for BEST funds is calculated by dividing the amount of BEST funds spent by the number of hours of services delivered.

Cost per hour of service for total funds is calculated by dividing the amount of BEST funds and matching funds by the number of hours of service delivered

Customer Satisfaction

Parent and children/youth satisfaction with services is determined by customers' responses to four questions about their satisfaction with the services they received. The four questions are summarized into a score from 0% -low to 100% - very high.

Evaluation

The process of collecting and analyzing information about a program to determine what works and what needs improvement. A professional evaluator must evaluate BEST programs. Results of the evaluation are published twice per year.

Indicators

Indicators are the specific items of information that track a program's success on **Outcomes**. Indicators describe observable, measurable characteristics or changes that represent achievement of an **Outcome**. For example, a program with a desired **Outcome** that participants pursue a healthy lifestyle might choose to measure Indicators such as: whether a participant successfully quits smoking; whether a participant increases levels of physical activity; or whether a participant's knowledge of HIV/AIDS is increased. The number and percent of a program's participants who demonstrate these changes in knowledge, behaviors, and/or skills is an Indicator of how well the program is doing with respect to the desired **Outcome**.

Inputs 1

Inputs are resources a program uses to achieve program objectives. Examples are staff, volunteers, facilities, equipment, curricula, and money. A program uses Inputs to support program activities. Inputs have an influence on a program's **Outputs** and **Outcomes**.

Match, Matching Funds

The amount of money that the Applicant or Grantee states it will raise in addition to BEST money. All Applicants must show that they will raise a match of at least 20% of the total program cost. BEST will not pay for more than 80% of a program's cost.

BEST

San José Fund Bringing Everyone's Strengths Together – BEST is one of the funding arms of the San José Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force and is administered by the San José Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services Department.

1 Adapted from James Bell, et al., *Measuring Program Outcomes: A Practical Approach*, United Way of America, 1996, p. xv.

Outcomes

Outcomes are benefits for participants during or after their involvement with a program. Outcomes are not the same as **Outputs**, nor are they measures of how many clients are served, how many program activities are delivered, nor the total number of **Units of Service**. Outcomes relate to positive changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, behavior, condition, or status. Examples of Outcomes include improved health status, increase in reading skills, more effective responses to conflict, getting a job, and having greater financial stability.

For a particular program, there can be various levels of Outcomes, with initial Outcomes leading to longer-term ones. For example, a youth in a mentoring program who receives one-to-one encouragement to improve academic performance may attend school more regularly, which can lead to getting better grades, which can lead to graduating, which can lead to attending college.

Outcomes are influenced by a program's **Inputs** and **Outputs**. Outcomes are measured using **Indicators**.

Outputs

Outputs are products of a program's activities, such as the number of meals provided, classes taught, brochures distributed, or participants served. BEST measures Outputs in terms of **Units of Service**. A program's Outputs should produce desired **Outcomes** for the program's participants. Outputs are influenced by a program's **Inputs**, and also have an influence on a program's **Outcomes**.

Qualitative

Qualitative is a term used to describe research that collects responses from people that are usually based in opinions. Information collected from interviews and focus groups are examples of Qualitative research. No definition encapsulates qualitative research completely.

Quantitative

Quantitative is a term used to describe research design or modes that count or tabulate information. Information collected from tests and surveys are examples of Quantitative research.

Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency of the survey reports.

Service Productivity Scores

Service Productivity Scores (growth in new skills and positive behaviors because of services) were used to measure the effectiveness of BEST funded services. The score is a percent that can be positive or negative and is calculated by taking the percent of targeted changes achieved minus the percent missed. Groups get no credit for customers' attitudes, behaviors, skills or knowledge that stay the same. The scores are in two areas. One measures child and youth developmental assets and is asked by all grantees of their customers. The second measure is customized questions design to measure agency specified changes (new skills and positive behaviors) because of their specific service to their customers.

Service Performance Index

When a wide variety of information is assembled about the performance of human service organizations, combining this information into one broad indicator of performance simplifies the task of learning what this information means.

The BEST Evaluation Team constructed one summary score to describe the overall performance of each of the 60 service agencies by combining 19 indicators of performance, grouped under the three rating categories employed by Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award Examiners: Approach, Deployment, and Results. Approach refers to how an organization is designed to operate effectively; deployment covers what the organization does to implement the design, and results refer to what is achieved. Two of the 19 indicators were given more weight, while the others were weighted equally. Ratings by evaluation team members of an agency's approach were weighted twice as much and the cost per hour of service was weighted five times as much. Service Performance Index has a maximum score of 1000 points and a score of over 600 is desirable.

Service Quality

Measures the consistency of service for all youth served. When services can be delivered consistently producing desired changes in youth customers this is a strong indicator of quality. The higher the number the higher the consistency of service delivered.

Unit of Service

A Unit of Service is simply a measurement of the amount of Services provided to the Client. BEST has defined 1 Unit of Service to be the same as 1 hour of service. For example, if a youth receives 3 hours of tutoring, that would count as 3 Units of Service.

Appendix C

BEST and MGPTF Evaluation Team



Community Crime Prevention Associates

Community Crime Prevention Associates (CCPA) was established in 1991 and has field offices in San José, San Mateo, and Oakland, California. CCPA has completed all of its contracted work, including strategic plans and evaluations, on time and on budget. CCPA's evaluation recommendations have an 85% acceptance rate. CCPA specializes in improving community capacity to improve neighborhoods and the quality of life for all residents. For example, CCPA has assisted the County of Santa Clara to design, implement, and evaluate over \$254 million in programming allocated to build healthy and resilient communities, families, and youth over the past 15 years. For the past 19 years, CCPA has served as the evaluator for the City of San José BEST Program. CCPA is currently assisting 158 community-based organizations, 312 schools, and 38 governmental agencies to obtain funding, implement services, and build evaluation systems to practice continuous improvement -- ultimately to build effective and efficient services for safer neighborhoods.

CCPA is proud to have been retained by its clients over time:

- assist the City of San José to continuously improve the efforts, effects, and results of their Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force and various prevention programs for the past 19 years;
- assist the County of Santa Clara Probation Department to strengthen its juvenile justice programs for the last 14 years;
- assist the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth to maximize after school and other opportunities for child and youth development for the last eight years; and

CCPA has business licenses in the cities of Oakland, San José, Santa Rosa, and Alameda, California.

Experience, Expertise, and Capacity

CCPA has extensive has experience and expertise in assisting communities, public agencies, and community-based organizations to:

- find the resources to address the needs of their target populations;
- identify and access community assets, as well as to increase community capacity to improve neighborhoods and the quality of life for residents;
- develop and implement common data systems, identify data variables that produce usable information, and develop data collection strategies in order to more effectively and efficiently measure outcomes from interventions;
- develop performance measurement, quality assurance, customer satisfaction, and other evaluation systems to measure and compare performance and productivity across a wide array of service providers;
- develop and implement systems to provide integrated and coordinated service delivery provided by multiple service providers through the use of a managed grant program with common data elements and common outcomes;
- design and implement assessment systems for communities to measure risk, protective, and resiliency factors found in communities, schools, and homes;
- design and implement continuum of services for prevention, intervention, and suppression programs through the coordination of a Community Crime Prevention Task Force;
- address school dropout and truancy prevention through programs that engage high-risk youth in their own learning;
- partner with schools to build programs that focus on important outcomes such as high school completion and college acceptance;
- develop and implement comprehensive re-entry strategies to reduce recidivism of youth returning to their homes, schools, and communities following detention;
- develop and implement a systems of graduated sanctions to address juvenile delinquency;
- craft and execute evaluation systems that measure inputs, process, outputs and outcomes of prevention and intervention programs by using a performance - logic model approach;
- engage in professional development programs designed to facilitate change and new service delivery systems;
- engage in an effective and comprehensive strategic planning process that involves the community stakeholders;
- conduct board development; and
- design and implement community-wide, multiple stakeholder reform initiatives related to the juvenile justice system.

Current Contracts

Currently, CCPA has the following contracts -- to assist in planning, coordination, implementation, and evaluation over \$48 million in annual allocations for direct services to children and youth:

- Oakland Fund for Children and Youth Evaluation
- San José Mayor's Gang Prevention Taskforce - BEST Program Evaluation
- San José After School Program
- San José Weed and Seed Evaluation
- San José State University Gear Up Program
- San José Healthy Neighborhood Venture Fund
- Santa Clara County Alternative Placement Academy Evaluation
- Santa Clara County Aftercare Program Evaluation
- Santa Clara County Restorative Justice Program Evaluation
- Santa Clara County Assessment Center Evaluation
- Santa Clara County Truancy Reduction Services Evaluation
- Santa Clara County Weed and Seed Evaluation
- San Mateo County TANF Evaluation
- Santa Rosa Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force Measure O Evaluation

CCPA has assisted in the following strategic action plans:

- San Jose Healthy Neighborhood Venture Fund Strategic Work Plan.
- Yearly Strategic Plans for San Jose Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force 1992-2011
- San Jose Weed and Seed strategy, implementation plan 1996-1999
- San Jose Police Department Professional Development System 2000-2002
- Santa Clara County Juvenile Justice Action Plan for years 1998-2004
- Santa Clara County Children Shelter Strategic Plan 2000
- San Jose Youth Anti -Tobacco Collaborative 2002

CCPA Partners and Associates

Peter Ellis is the founding partner of CCPA. Dr. Ellis has been involved in community organizing and building community capacity for the past 40 years. He continues to apply and research resiliency variables as they relate to the development of pro-social and successful youth development. Dr. Ellis has spent the last 15 years developing and researching the impact of community-driven programs designed to improve the quality of life for youth, families, and communities. Specifically, Dr. Ellis has served as the principal researcher for developing and implementing the evaluation of the 78 youth service programs funded by the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth. Also, since 1992, Dr. Ellis has provided technical assistance and consultation in applying current research about youth and family resiliency to the San José Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force annual strategic plan. He assisted the Task Force to develop a nationally recognized community coalition model to direct services to high-risk youth. Dr. Ellis is a past member of the Golden Feather Union School Board and past president of the Butte County School Board Association, as well as a co-founder of the University of Phoenix. Dr. Ellis earned his Ph.D in Community Education and Administration from the University of Michigan.

Rachel Camacho has over ten years experience working with youth and youth-led programs in both northern and southern California. Ms. Camacho has been involved in evaluating numerous youth service programs in Santa Clara County, and the Cities of San José and Oakland. Ms. Camacho assists in the overall coordination of the OFCY youth evaluator component and works closely with community-based providers to build their capacity to conduct program evaluations. Currently, Ms. Camacho serves as the lead for the CCPA's evaluation of the City of San José Bringing Everyone's Strength Together, Healthy Neighborhoods Venture Fund, and After School Programs. Ms. Camacho has also successfully performed grant writing and worked to develop programs and strategies that assist young people to raise their expectations for their future. Ms. Camacho earned her B.A. in Sociology from Pitzer College and M.A. in Education at Claremont Graduate University.

CCPA Associates

CCPA Associates are all independent consultants who have worked on numerous CCPA contracts for evaluation and strategic planning.

Shirly S. Lee is currently coordinating the Juvenile Detention Reform (JDR) effort in Santa Clara County. Ms. Lee secured funds for the JDR effort and led the process to garner support from Santa Clara County policy makers, law and justice practitioners, and other community stakeholders. JDR is a comprehensive movement to reduce reliance on detention as a way to work with troubled youth, create community-based alternatives to detention, and improve conditions of confinement. Ms. Lee is also involved in evaluating numerous youth service programs in Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties, and the Cities of San José and Oakland. Ms. Lee was trained by the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) in community organizing and worked in the Pico-Union district of Los Angeles. Ms. Lee completed her undergraduate degree at the University of California, Los Angeles and earn a J.D.R. degree at Stanford University.

Rex S. Green is the Principal Advisor of GreenScene Results Group, a consulting firm devoted to assisting health and human service organizations improve the effectiveness of their services. Dr. Green led or assisted with over 15 grant-funded studies of the effects of health and human services on recipients for several research organizations. He has reviewed numerous submissions for publication to research journals and has written over 20 journal articles and book chapters on measuring and improving service effectiveness. Within the past seven years, he earned certificates of expertise in knowledge and management of health information systems from the American Health Information Management Association and in the application of quality improvement techniques and tools from the American Society for Quality. Dr. Green works with health and human service

agency managers to incorporate client monitoring systems and performance indicators into routine agency operations. Dr. Green earned his Ph.D. in Quantitative Psychology from the University of Southern California.

Patrick Dwyer has extensive experience in law enforcement and community policing. He has been the Chief of Police for the City of Palo Alto and since retiring has worked as interim Chief of Police for the cities of Hayward and Sunnyvale. He retired from the San José Police Department as a Captain after 32 years of service. He has been a national leader in the community policing, crime prevention, and detention reform. He has served on the board of numerous community based organizations and Rotary Clubs. He is the law-enforcement consultant to the Annie E. Casey Foundations and Santa Clara County for their Juvenile Detention Reform efforts. Pat was a member of the “*Si Se Puede*” Program Management Team (Multi-Agency, Community Development Program) that served as the original model for San Jose’s Project Crackdown that was adopted by the federal government for their Weed and Seed national strategy. Chief Dwyer has a B.A. from San José State University and is a graduate of the California Law Enforcement Command College and the FBI Law Enforcement Executive Development Seminar.

Octave Baker specializes in helping nonprofit organizations and community-based groups build capacity. He consults on: Strategic planning, Developing community-based collaboratives and partnerships, Leadership development, Organizational change, and Cultural competence and inclusion. Dr. Baker received his doctorate in Community and Organizational Psychology from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. He holds certificates from (1) the Gestalt Institute of Cleveland in organization and systems development, (2) the Stanford Institute of Intercultural Communication, and (3) the Professional School of Psychology in Sacramento, CA, in Executive Coaching. In addition, he is certified to facilitate the Drucker Foundation Self-Assessment Instrument for strategic planning with nonprofit organizations. Dr. Baker co-founded Communication Training Consultants (CTC) in 1981, now based in Oakland, CA. He is a partner with CTC and a faculty member in the Engineering Management and Leadership Program at Santa Clara University.

Maria Elena Riddle has dedicated 34 years to education-related services ranging from pre-school through the university level. She is one of the founders of The National Hispanic University and its acting President for 18 months in 2003-2005. She has recently retired from The National Hispanic University after 32 years of service. She is continuing to dedicate her life to insuring educational opportunities for all our children and youth. She has served as the Director of Child Care at the Vida Bilingual Children’s Center, Upward Bound program, Educational Talent Search program, and was responsible for all state and federal contracts at The National Hispanic University. She has extensive experience in organizing and delivering parent education programs and teacher professional development programs. Ms. Riddle has dedicated her career to assisting parents and their children to maximize the educational opportunities available to them. She specializes in assisting groups to collaborate across public and private sectors to implement solutions to community problems. Maria Elena is language proficient in Spanish. Ms. Riddle completed her master’s degree in education from Santa Clara University and has held an elementary teaching credential and bilingual specialist credential.

Eury Ramos has extensive experience developing, managing, and evaluating children, youth, and family education programs. He has supervised the operations of five Head Start Centers and designed professional development curriculum. Dr. Ramos monitored the implementation of the Federal Performance Standards for the Head Start Programs and was the director of the first bilingual childcare center in California. He has also worked in numerous housing projects to assist residents link to pre-school, school services, and community services. Dr. Ramos has developed health education and risk assessment programs and delivered these programs at pre-school centers, church groups, and non-profit organizations. He is fluent in verbal and written Spanish language. Dr. Ramos earned his Ed.D. from the University of San Francisco in International Multicultural Education.

Mark Browne served as the director of a residential treatment center which included an emergency shelter and diagnostic assessment center. In addition to creating and overseeing the assessment center program, Mr. Browne was responsible for the design of the core behavior management systems in operation at all five different program sites. These various programs were initiated as part of an effort to develop a continuum of care in children’s services and, in collaboration with a number of sponsors and partners, operated as an integrated service delivery system for the children and families of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Mr. Browne has worked with the Santa Clara County Children’s Shelter as a consultant to assist in improving services to the youth served by the Shelter. He also worked with numerous community-based organizations in Santa Clara

County in assisting agencies to build additional capacity to meet their missions. Mr. Browne earned his graduate degree in psychology from the University of Rhode Island.

Marco Antonio Cruz has over twelve years experience working with youth to promote their success in K-12 and undergraduate education. Mr. Cruz has directed model programs to foster the academic and social success of low-income, first-generation, and language minority youth assisting them to pursue their postsecondary educational objective. Mr. Cruz previously held a faculty appointment at The National Hispanic University in the Department of General Studies. Mr. Cruz earned his B.A. in Sociology at the University of California, Davis and M.A. in Education at Santa Clara University.

Tanya Maria Baker coordinates the activities of the OFCY evaluation process. Ms. Baker conducts the recruitment, training, and oversight of a 30-member Youth Evaluation Team. As the coordinator of the OFCY evaluation process, Ms. Baker works closely with over 80 community-based providers in collecting data, disseminating information, and scheduling site visits. She also worked for The National Hispanic University as a Talent Search College Advisor for middle school students and as an Upward Bound Head Residential Advisor for high school students. Ms. Baker is language proficient in Spanish and earned her undergraduate degree in Liberal Studies and minored in Spanish from California State University, East Bay.

Community Crime Prevention Associates Performance Logic Model Evaluation Approach Publications

Demonstrating the Effectiveness of Performance Logic Model Evaluation Approach

Once programs being evaluated by CCPA using this evaluation approach began generating effects data in sufficient quantity, our team started analyzing the data to create some articles to share with the field. Two articles was published in 2005, a second article is scheduled to appear later in 2005, and two more articles are under review. Copies of these articles are available upon request from the CCPA office. The following are brief descriptions of the four studies.

Summarizing Performance Logic Model Approach

An explanation of our evaluation approach was published in the journal, "Evaluation and Program Planning," an international journal published by Elsevier Science, in the Winter 2005 issue. This journal uses a blind review process, so that reviewers can provide objective feedback to authors. The article was accepted for publication in September 2004 following two rounds of review.

The importance of studying the effects of services utilizing measures of service productivity was underscored, since it is difficult, if not impossible, to discern the contribution of services to customer changes in developmental assets when applying more standard types of client outcome measures. This summary provides a good starting point for learning about our evaluation approach. We recommend reading this article before reading any of the following three articles.

Does Measuring Service Productivity Work?

Whenever an innovative measurement method is introduced, it is essential that the characteristics of the new method be examined. This type of study focuses on the measure's psychometrics—reliability, validity, generalizability, and any special properties of the measure being cited as advantages.

Our second article, appeared in the same journal "Evaluation and Program Planning" later this spring of 2005, compares one application of our measure of service productivity in the spring of 2002 with two applications of our measure of developmental assets in both the fall and spring for programs operating in two different cities. Typically, we recommend applying the standard measure of developmental assets only in the fall, to carefully assess levels of developmental assets of youth being served. These scores tell us whether programs are serving youth with more or fewer developmental assets. Ideally, programs should target those youth with fewer assets. For several reasons, applying this measure twice to the same youth customers really does not take good aim at what services accomplish, but rather on what changes youth experience overall, regardless of the causal factor. Nevertheless, we wanted to demonstrate that our two

types of measures of developmental assets performed more similarly than each measure with other measures that focused on different phenomena, such as satisfaction with services. We also compared their reliabilities, while expecting that the longer measure would achieve higher reliability, but not too much higher. The psychometric results from analyzing the data collected from programs in one city strongly supported our expectations, while data analyzed from the other city provided support, with qualifications. We were satisfied that our recommendation that service productivity only needs to be assessed one time is sound. Also, we demonstrated that our measure of service productivity was more sensitive to what the agencies' services accomplish than the repeated application of our longer, standard measure.

Appendix D

SAN JOSÉ BEST OJJDP PARENT TRAINING EVALUATION REPORT SEPTEMBER 2007 - MAY 2008

Note to Reader: The page numbers are stand alone in this report. Evaluators inserted the PDF report submitted this year to OJJDP that provided the majority of funds to this effort.